DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 240 IR 007 154

AUTHOR MacVean, Donald S.
TITLE An NCATE Evaluation of a University Library: A Case History.
PUB DATE Jan 79
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluators; Higher Education; Library Administration; *Library Standards; Qualifications; University Administration; *University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS *National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educ; *Western Illinois University

ABSTRACT

This report documents the procedures and problems encountered during the evaluation of Western Illinois University's library by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and proposes recommendations for future evaluations of university libraries. Basic problems with the NCATE evaluation involved: (1) an unqualified library evaluator; (2) the absence of a library specialist on the visiting team and the failure of the Provost and Dean of Education to check on visiting team qualifications; (3) providing detail about the library in the institutional report, which resulted in misinterpretation by the evaluator; and (4) the lack of library evaluation due to vague standards and unqualified evaluators. It is recommended that visiting team members should be more conscientiously selected from rosters of nominees provided by NCATE's constituent and associate organizations, and that NCATE should arrange with one of the library associations to nominate persons qualified to evaluate college and university libraries. In particular, NCATE should revise its standards on libraries so that they are more specific and meaningful. (CWM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171240

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN NCATE EVALUATION OF A UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

A CASE HISTORY

BY

Donald S. MacVean

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donald S. MacVean

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

IR007154

An NCATE Evaluation of a University Library --

A Case History

Donald S. Mac Vean
Head Reference Librarian
Western Illinois University
Macomb, IL 61455
January, 1979

Introduction--The preparation of this report was prompted by the writer's experience with university library evaluations by accrediting agencies--three by NCATE and three by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools--over a period of more than twenty years. None was done in a satisfactory fashion for the sole reason that the persons assigned to evaluate the libraries were not qualified by either education or experience to perform the task.

The case described here was a part of the NCATE evaluation of Western Illinois University in 1973. At that time the author was Director of Libraries at that institution. It is hoped that a frank and clear description of what transpired during this evaluation will generate discussion and perhaps additional writing about NCATE's procedures and lead to improvement, particularly in the selection of its library evaluators.

NCATE--The National Council For Accreditation of Teacher Education was organized in 1952 by its then five constituent organizations: The American Association of Colleges For Teacher Education, The Council of Chief State School Officers, The National Association of Directors of

IR007154

Teacher Education and Certification, The National Education Association, and The National School Boards Association. In 1956, NCATE was recognized by the National Commission on Accrediting (NCA), now the Commission on Postsecondary Accrediting (COPA), as the sole agency for accrediting teacher education.(1-515)

As a current publication of the Council states, the "Purpose of the Council shall be the accreditation of College and University Programs of teacher education in the United States. The Council shall seek to accomplish this purpose essentially through the application of standards to programs of teacher education."(2:6) The latter is done by a team of visitors or evaluators at institutions seeking accreditation or reaccreditation. Programs evaluated vary with the institutions' request or application but include the following: elementary and secondary school teachers, principals, supervisors, curriculum directors, guidance counselors, school psychologists, and superintendents. Following the visiting teams' reports, the Council may accredit any, all, or none of the programs, the decision hinging on the recommendations of the Evaluation Board and its own final decision. Only those institutions which offer a bachelor's degree and which are accredited by their state Education agency and one of the six regional accrediting associations, are eligible for accreditation by NCATE. In practice, few eligible institutions are refused accreditation but it is conditional in some cases and in other instances is granted for a shorter time than the usual ten year period. The 24th annual list of accredited institutions issued in 1978 included 554 names. This is fewer than one-half of the institutions which offer teacher education programs.

The Institution--Western Illinois University was chartered by the General Assembly in 1899 as Western Illinois State Normal School. It has had three name changes since that date and in 1957 was designated as Western Illinois University. The preparation of teachers has always been and continues to be a major purpose of the institution but a smaller percentage of students are currently enrolled in such programs than in former years. Its teacher education programs have been accredited since 1928, first by the American Association of Teachers Colleges and later by that association's successors, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and NCATE.[1]

NCATE Standards--The standards in effect at the time this visit took place (1973) were those adopted by the Council in January 1970.(4) In all, they encompass a document of 25 pages divided into two parts. Part I is applied to basic programs or those for the initial preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel including five-year and M.A.T. programs. Part II includes the standards for the post-baccalaureate or advanced programs for the same types of personnel and apply to the 6th year, or specialist, and doctoral degrees. It is clearly stated, however, that the standards are not applicable to degree programs for college teachers.(4:1)

Each part of the document contains five standards, each of which has several sub-parts. The standards on the library are in each case a sub-part of standard number 4 entitled "Resources and Facilities." They are as follows:

---

[1]Verified by examination of the University's catalogs.

4.1 Library
The library is viewed as the principal educational materials resource and information storage and retrieval center for an institution. As a principal resource for teaching and learning, the library holdings in teacher education are sufficient in number for the students served and pertinent to the types and levels of programs offered. The recommendations of faculty members and national professional organizations are seriously considered in maintaining and building the collection. Library service assures both students and faculty members access to the holdings.

Standard: The library is adequate to support the instruction, research, and services pertinent to each teacher education program.(4:8)

G-4.1 Library
The adequacy of library holdings is a major factor in establishing the quality of advanced programs. As the principal educational materials resource and the information storage and retrieval center of an institution, the library holdings are adequate for the number of students and faculty to be served, and pertinent to the kind and level of graduate programs offered. The operation of advanced programs requires library resources substantially larger than those required for basic programs. The library resources required for doctoral programs vary widely but, in any case, they are substantial, and considerably exceed those for master's programs.

The recommendations of faculty members and professional organizations are given serious consideration in maintaining and building the collection. Adequate library service is provided to assure that students and faculty members have access to the holdings.

Standard: The library provides resources that are adequate to support instruction, independent study, and research required for each advanced program. (4:14-15)

The above are simple, rather innocuous statements, surely, and leave much to personal judgment. None of the well known standards for college and university library book collections such as Clapp-Jordan(5) or American Library Association(6) are mentioned at all. This probably stems from the fact that NCATE has deliberately avoided

expressing its standards in quantitative terms, preferring instead to use broad, general statements which suggest a certain level of quality. Since it evaluates institutions which vary so greatly in size and purpose this may be a defensible position but it puts a much greater burden on the evaluator. This person's qualifications must be beyond reproach.

Preparation For The Visit--The university had last been granted accreditation by NCATE in 1962 for the usual period of ten years. Thus, reaccreditation was in order in 1972, but the visit did not take place until 1973 and reaccreditation was not granted until 1974. The procedure for gaining accreditation is outlined in an NCATE publication (2:8-9), as follows:

1. The institution files a Preliminary Report for administrative and planning purposes.
2. The institution develops a Self-Study Report for the Council.
3. A visiting team, using this report as a base, evaluates the teacher education programs and reports its findings to the Evaluation Board.
4. A copy of the visiting Team Report is sent to the institution to be checked for accuracy.
5. The Council's Evaluation Board reviews the reports submitted by the institution and by the team and makes a recommendation to the Council. Representatives of the institutions and visiting team chairpersons are invited to meet with the Evaluation Board.
6. The Council as a whole takes action on each application for accreditation based on the recommendation of the Evaluation Board. Evidence to support each recommendation is available to the Council for study or review prior to the Council meeting.
7. The Director informs the administrative officer of the institution concerned of the action taken by the Council. This constitutes the official report of the Council to the institution. Such action is taken only at regular meetings of the Council, usually twice each year.
8. An institution has three options (a) to accept the decision, (b) to request a review of the case within 30 days when it is felt that the data are correct but a wrong decision has been reached, and (c) request an appeal when it is felt that the process has failed.

Point 2 above, the preparation of the self-study report proved to be quite a task. Ten committees, plus a steering committee, involving in all 57 people, spent slightly more than a year (but not full time) in preparing it. There were duplicate committees for basic and advanced programs and the author served on the two entitled "Resources and Facilities" because it was here that the library services were described. The report in its final form consisted of four volumes with a total of 750 pages.(3)

The report was prepared in accord with a guide issued by NCATE, itself a document of thirty pages.(5) Here more specific suggestions as to what is expected of the library are found. They are as follows:

For Basic Teacher Education Programs

> Since the general characteristic of the library (for the entire institution's use) may be quite brief in Chapter 1, add at this point, but briefly, any additional information which will describe this resource. What are its holdings in standard books (or titles); in periodicals; Government or other special documents; micro-materials of various kinds; other? What is the scope and adequacy of its financing? If past events have resulted in deficiencies, how is the institution "catching up"? What services is it able to offer the general academic community? If the institution augments its holdings through cooperative agreements with nearby institutions, what are those arrangements? To what degree does the institution know that such agreements make new and different resources available rather than just adding more copies of books which the institution already holds? To what degree is the library, as a general resource, balanced in its holdings instead of holding an acceptable total which is overstocked in one area and deficient in others?
>
> Following the description of the library as a learning resource for all students, discuss the library as a resource for teacher education. Explain in what ways the library is "adequate to support the institution, research, and services" for basic programs in teacher education (Standard 4.1). Show what steps the institution has taken to judge that the support is adequate in the professional teaching areas (educational psychology and psychology, social and philosophical foundations, with related books, methodology, and so on). Show what steps the institution has

taken to judge that the support is adequate in the academic areas which represent the teaching fields. To what extent are faculty groups involved? To what extent are standard reading lists (when available) used? To what extent are recommendations published by societies and organizations considered? Indicate the level of support. How adequate is it? Are the holdings relevant, up-to-date and vital, or is the library holding old and useless books?

Since books, periodicals, and other materials (however appropriate) are relatively ineffective unless used, explain briefly whatever facts are available to show that instructors are encouraging the use of these resources and that students are, in fact, using them. What circulation statistics can be presented to demonstrate that this is happening? What institutional evaluations have been made to determine that library hours are adequate· books are available; and that the library staff is adequate to meet its operational needs?(5:11)

For Advanced Programs

Describe the library in general as a resource for graduate work at the institution. Is there a separate graduate facility? Does it have special features which relate positively to graduate work? Are there faculty committees or faculty advisory boards which focus specifically on problems relating to library services and resources to graduate programs?

If the institution has not written a report on Basic Programs, which calls for some descriptive materials about the library generally, turn to Chapter 2, Section 3, Basic Programs, and provide that information in connection with this chapter.

Relate what steps the institution takes to make its instructional resources, including the library, available to students. Discuss in general, but be sure to deal with two special problems: (a) students who are on campus at odd hours--late afternoons, evenings, and on weekends, and (b) students who are taking courses off campus.(5:26)

As useful as the above questions and suggestions proved to be in preparing the institutional self-study it should be emphasized that they are not a part of the standards and, as far as is known, were not provided to the visiting team of evaluators.

The section of the report describing the library covered 21 1/2 pages and was divided into 2 parts, one for basic programs and the other for advanced programs. All of the questions and suggestions contained in guide were responded to and in the interest of openness and thoroughness and in the hope of a very searching appraisal, much additional material, including statistics was prepared. Included were such topics as the following: the physical facility, finances, the staff, the book and journal collections (including ratings based on widely used standards and percentages of titles held which appear in basic lists and indexes), use statistics, selection practices, and such basic and special services as reference, interlibrary loan, and the curriculum laboratory. It was a very full report with deficiencies as well as strengths clearly revealed.

Selection of the Visiting Team--In its application, the university requested accreditation or reaccreditation for the following teacher education programs: Elementary and Secondary teaching at both the baccalaureate and master's levels, Elementary and Secondary School Principal, Supervisors, Curriculum Coordinator, and Superintendent at the Sixth-year or Specialist level, and School Counselor and School Psychologist at the Master's level.(3:xii) The standards state that any other teacher education programs offered are also subject to scrutiny, " . . . in order that the Council may relate the accreditation request to the total institutional offerings and institutional resources."(4:2) Since the above mentioned offerings are quite broad, NCATE officials formed a team consisting of a chairman and ten members, each of whom was assigned as evaluator of a certain program, a support

service, or given some special assignment. The specific assignments were as follows:

The academic component of teacher preparation
Programs for the preparation of secondary teachers
Programs for the preparation of elementary teachers
Laboratory experiences of all types
The organization, structure, faculty and general system of teacher education
Specific programs in preparation of school administrators
All graduate programs in guidance and counseling
Learning resources
The graduate school operation
Specific programs in reading

For each assignment, other than the chairmanship, NCATE submitted two names and the university could reject either or both without statement of cause. The university also could react to the structure of the committee and suggest either deletions or additions of assignments.

The above information was provided by the Director of NCATE in a letter to the Provost and Academic Vice President on March 29, 1973 with notice that any suggestions about the composition of the team or choices between nominees for each assignment or rejections of both must be reported within two weeks. The Provost's only action was to refer the letter to the Dean of the School of Education. The latter person did not consult with members of the committee or discuss the matter with other local officials and made no response to NCATE.

The Library Evaluator--The author was not informed as to membership of the visiting team until July 30, long past the date by which choices could be made or objections to both names could be offered. The person selected had experience as a school teacher and school librarian and for the past nineteen years had been the supervisor of school libraries

in a large city public school system. Although she had a Master's degree in Library Science she had no experience at all in college or university libraries. The author lodged an objection to this appointment on the basis of qualifications to the Provost and the Dean of Education, but, as noted above, the date by which anything could be done was long past. This oversight was to be the point of serious embarrassment later.

The Visit--The visiting team was on campus from October 29-31, 1973. On the first day, the evaluators of the "Graduate School Operation" and "Learning Resources" (the library was included in this grouping) met with the author for about an hour. The first person was a Graduate School Dean in a similar type of institution in a neighboring state, and, as mentioned earlier, the library evaluator was a school library supervisor in a midwest metropolitan school district. Most of the questions were addressed by the Dean and were intended to elucidate and amplify parts of the institutional report on the library. Certain deficiencies had been clearly stated in the report, particularly the building and the book collection. The author explained that a new building was planned for 4-5 years hence and that the inadequacies in that part of book collection relating to Education were largely in foreign language titles and those on comparative education. There had been little or no demand for such titles. It was also explained that while the books on Education ranked third in terms of use, this was used largely by the on-campus undergraduate students, not by the advanced students, most of whom are non-resident and part-time only. The use of the library by the latter group was minimal and thus the deficiencies on Education in the book collection were more apparent than real. Both persons seemed satisfied with the answers to their questions.

The following day (October 30) the library evaluator called on the author for about an hour. She acknowledged she had not been on an NCATE team before and was not familiar with the NCATE standards or the procedures followed in institutional evaluation. This was promptly demonstrated because the author had to show her which part of the standards pertained to the library. She had read the institutional report but it is doubtful that it was very meaningful to her. She was quite unfamiliar with the various standards for college and university library book collections and, in fact, had never heard of the Clapp-Jordan formula,(6) one which was widely used in the late 1960's. During the course of the conversation, the author made reference to the "NUC" and she asked what was meant. Soon it became apparent that she was totally unfamiliar with the National Union Catalog (NUC) and its predecessor, the Library of Congress Author Catalog. These titles taken together constitute the most basic of all bibliographic tools used by college and university libraries. When checklists and selection aids for book collections were mentioned she was unfamiliar with Books for College Libraries, Outstanding Academic Books, The American Behavioral Scientist and others of equal importance.

During the course of the conversation, the evaluator asked why audio-visual materials were not a part of the library. It was explained that the Audio-Visual service (Office of Instructional Technology) was located in the library building but that it had its own Director and from the beginning had been administered separately. Present policy was to continue this separation. She showed annoyance at this and made it clear that she believed the two services should be integrated. The author offered a number of reasons why this could not be so. It was

not an open question here because such an integration was precluded by administrative policy of long standing and that the library had neither budget nor space (not even in new building) to accommodate audio-visual materials. It was pointed out that the audio-visual service would be given additional space in the present library building when the new one was available in 1978 or 1979.

During the same conference the author informed the evaluator that between the time of writing of the institutional report and her visit, an interval of more than a year, the Curriculum Laboratory had been transferred administratively from the library to the School of Education. She seemed concerned about this, particularly the fact that it was no longer directed by a librarian.*

---

*Since this administrative change became the basis of a critical comment in the visiting team's report, a detailed description of events leading up to it will be given.

The Curriculum Laboratory was established as a department of the library in 1963, implementing a recommendation contained in the report of the NCATE evaluation of 1962. Generally it was well supported in terms of budget and staff and was used extensively by the students in teacher education programs and some of the inservice teachers in the county. By 1969, however, lack of space for the proper functioning of the department was critical. There were three reasons for this: (1) increased use due to a rapidly growing student body; (2) normal growth of the collection; and (3) creation of a department of Special Education and its heavy demand for materials, most of which were non-book items in the form of boxed games, kits, toys, and various manipulative devices. These items took up an inordinate amount of space. Since the new library building which was then in the planning stage would not be erected and occupied for at least four years, spaces outside the present building were sought for the relocation of one or more library departments. The Curriculum Laboratory was one which it was believed could operate outside the central building with the least difficulty. An abandoned gymnasium was offered to the library for expansion purposes but it was deemed suitable only for storage. At about the same time (1969) the Chairman of the Special Education Department began a campaign to have the Curriculum Laboratory moved to the School of Education building (Horrabin Hall), arguing that at present it was too distant from the classrooms and students in the School of Education, particularly his students in Special Education. It was true

The two conferences just mentioned were the only ones the author had with the library evaluator. It is known that she spent some additional time in the building but not what was done. It was hoped she would verify the data in the institutional report, or at least a sample of it by consulting the appropriate records. These were all available to her but she made no use of them.

---

that most of the users of the Curriculum Laboratory were School of Education students but methods students in the academic subjects (History, English, Art, Mathematics, etc.) also used it and it had been shown that students used the facility in conjunction with other library departments, not in isolation. The professional books and journals in Education which are used in conjunction with curriculum materials were not there, rather they were in the main library. But despite good reasons for keeping the Curriculum Laboratory in the central library (which were lost entirely on the other side) the library administration was amenable to moving the department but the space offered in the School of Education building was 200 square feet less than that occupied in the main library. Thus, it would be self-defeating to agree to such a change. As a result nothing was done for almost two years.

Early in 1971, the Dean of the School of Education got into the act. Under pressure from the Chairman of the Special Education Department and at the same time searching for some tactic to buoy the hopes of the school, he became militant on the issue of moving the Curriculum Laboratory to Horrabin Hall. It should be added here that by this time the fortunes of the School of Education were sinking rapidly. Due to the oversupply of teachers, which had become apparent by then, students were either not enrolling in or were transferring out of teacher education programs. With the exception of Special Education, all departments were shrinking and as a result the budget for the school was reduced and faculty and staff positions were lost. Somehow or other the Dean of Education arrived at the notion that having the Curriculum Laboratory as a part of the school would be a plus in the report of the Task Force on Teacher Education scheduled for the following fall. How this could be so was never explained.

Several conversations about moving the Curriculum Laboratory were held at this time but again only a smaller space (the same as in 1969) was offered. When the author again refused, the Dean appealed to the Provost who was the superior of both persons. In a very hastily arranged meeting and one in which the facts of the matter were not presented accurately or in detail, the Provost sided with the Dean of Education and directed the library administration to move the Curriculum Laboratory to Horrabin Hall during the post-summer session. The Dean, did, however, agree to provide more space at the end of a year and one more room was added the following summer. But due to the rapid addition of the very bulky nonbook items this space was soon filled and more was requested.

The Report of the Visiting Team--The report was received on March 7, 1974.(8) The part on the library was found in section 4 entitled "Instructional Resources For Basic Programs." The evaluators (the opinions expressed are those of at least a majority of the team, not those of only the person assigned to investigate a particular part of a program) offered no objections to the description of the library contained in the

---

At this time (1973) the Laboratory High School was phased out and a number of rooms were vacated. In April, two of these were promised for expansion of the Curriculum Laboratory, to be available in June. In the interim, however, the Dean learned that he had to move the Special Education Department from the College of Education Building (Stipes Hall) to Horrabin Hall and that a Reading Clinic had to be accommodated. He found, therefore, that he was over-committed on space and he could not honor his agreement with the library. The library administration now sought another and larger place to move the Curriculum Laboratory. The prospect of the removal of the facility from Horrabin Hall, however, upset a number of people in the School of Education and so, shortly, thereafter, the Dean of Education proposed to the Provost, unbeknownst to the author, that administrative control of the Curriculum Laboratory be transferred from the Library to the School of Education. If this were done, he could ignore his previous agreement to provide proper space for it. Within a short time, the Provost acquainted the author with the Dean's proposal and, rather sheepishly, acknowledged the awkwardness of the situation. He had sided with the Dean of Education in the struggle that had taken place two years ago, hoping to improve the situation, and now found it worse than before. He acknowledged that the Dean of Education couldn't live up to his agreement on space but he (the Provost) wouldn't support efforts to remove the Curriculum Laboratory from Horrabin Hall. (And, it must be added, no satisfactory place to move it had been found anyway). The Provost then recommended that the department be separated administratively from the Library and assigned to the School of Education. This would let the Dean out of an agreement he could not honor and would get the problem off the Provost's desk. The proposal came as a complete surprise to the author so he asked for time to study all implications of it. This was granted.

In reviewing the literature on Curriculum Laboratories, it was found that nationally the prevailing practice was to treat the agencies as library functions and to administer them as such.(7:2) It was also found, however, that these agencies had declined in importance both in terms of teacher training and in relationship to the libraries of which they were a part. This was true in the local situation where teacher education was now only one of many instructional programs rather than the only one as had been the case twenty years ago. It was to decline still further in the years ahead. It was also clear that what had once been a Curriculum Laboratory with emphasis on printed materials had now become, due to the influx of non-book items, a teaching aids

institutional report but did add some statistical data contained in the author's annual report 1972-73 which had appeared since the former had been prepared. They agreed that the library building was too small and the collections were inadequate for size of the university and the scope of the instructional program. It was acknowledged, however, that progress in collection development had been considerable and the size of the

---

laboratory and therefore not strictly a library type facility. Perhaps more crucial in causing change in the library administration's attitude toward the facility were the facts that the space demands and budget requirements were increasing while at the same time its relative importance was decreasing. The department was now located outside the library and the author could not control its space allotments. Its increasing operational costs were a drain on the library budget and these funds were badly needed for other purposes. It was clear, therefore, that advantages would accrue to the library if it was rid of the Curriculum Laboratory. Accordingly its transfer to the School of Education was agreed to and made effective on August 17, 1973.

The Dean of Education had solved one problem but immediately inherited another. Apparently he was not aware of the budget requirements for the Curriculum Laboratory, which were $32,000 annually and which the library had paid in the past. Now such costs were his responsibility and came at a time when his budget was being reduced. He had no way of providing such funds and, as expected, reduced the budget drastically. Rather than employ a librarian he assigned a person part-time to direct the laboratory who had been "bumped" from her former assignment by a tenured person in the High School when it closed. This person had no training at all for the position. No clerk was made available and the allotment for student assistants was only half what it had been. Funds for purchase of printed materials were kept at approximately the same figure but allotments for equipment, binding, and travel were all abolished. Such reductions had serious impact on the services of the Curriculum Laboratory, most notably on the hours of opening. These were greatly reduced. Nor was the space problem solved satisfactorily. The collections were again moved, this time into part of the area formerly occupied by the High School Library. This room was shared with other functions and the Curriculum Laboratory largely lost its identity. The space given to it was even smaller than before.

In retrospect it is clear that neither the Provost or the Dean of Education had the best interests of the teacher education program at heart in acting on this matter. The provost wanted only to get a vexing problem off of his desk and one that probably he considered of minor importance. The Dean, on the other hand, apparently thought there was some status or publicity value in having another agency under his control and was either unaware or unconcerned about its proper function or the cost of maintaining it.

periodical collection which then totalled 4,901 subscriptions, was commented on favorably.

There were several comments about the library that require detailed discussion. First, concern was expressed about the removal of the Curriculum Laboratory from the central library, its detachment from the jurisdiction of the Director of Libraries, and the fact that no trained librarian was assigned to operate it. Probably it was due to the influence of the library evaluator that this comment appeared in the report. Due to differences of opinion among the team, however, no recommendation was made. Actually, a thorough investigation would have revealed a great deal that was wrong. Shortly after the Curriculum Laboratory became a part of the School of Education, services deteriorated seriously and rapidly. As a replacement for the librarian, who was withdrawn, a faculty member who had had no similar experience or library training was assigned to operate it (with the title of librarian, unfortunately), no clerical assistant was assigned, student assistant services were reduced, hours of opening were shortened, space for the facility was lessened, and, due to an almost total disregard for security of the materials, the loss rate soon exceeded the rate of additions. But these problems were not apparent to one viewing the facility for only a few minutes and certainly they were not acknowledged.

A second comment about the library in the visiting team's report that deserves mention was as follows: " . . . Although the Director of Libraries impressed members of the visiting team with his professional leadership competence and his apparent support of the University's teacher education program, he displayed what the visiting team believed to have been an unfortunate disinterest in the responsibility for the

University's non-printed instructional resources. The visiting team's appraisal of the institution's current manner of administering instructional resources, as well as its judgment regarding the type of administrative structure which the University should posit for its new library building and collection, have been based upon the belief that all instructional materials should be purchased, accessioned and controlled from one point. If the University chooses to adopt the alternative of separate administrative structures, the visiting team found a need for the development of a campus-wide system for coping with the non-printed materials."(8:32-33) In those awkward, scarcely grammatical sentences, the library evaluator took a slap at both the author and the Audio-Visual Service (Office of Instructional Technology). As noted earlier, she had said they should be jointly administered. This was purely a personal bias of hers, and not a well founded one. If she had carefully read the NCATE standards, she would have found the following: "A materials and instructional media center for teacher education is maintained either as a part of the library, or as one or more separate units, and is adequate to support the teachers education programs."(4:8) The task of the evaluator is to apply the approved standards to the institution. He or she is free to make judgments and recommendations but they should be in accord with the standards. Thus, to criticize the institution for pursuing a policy of administrative separation of the Library and the Audio-Visual Service, when specifically permitted by the standards, was entirely out of order.

In the summary statement about the undergraduate programs, these statements appear: "The library is an acknowledged area of weakness. The President and the Provost placed it in the highest priority level

as a need for capital improvement, and although the faculty generally did not appear to be excessively disturbed by the lack of instructional materials, members of the team found library holdings to be significantly below the levels required by an institution of this size and complexity." (8:55-56)

In the section on Advanced Programs for teachers, specifically, the . . . Ed. Specialist Degree, this statement appears: "Although all of the six full-time professors categorized library holdings as "adequate," an admission by the University President, the Institutional Report (vol.1, pp. 65-73), and personal investigation by members of this team indicate that holdings are less than adequate. However, commendable efforts at improvement are being made, as indicated by the excellent periodical selection and the institutionally reported fact that "more than one-half of the books . . . have been added in the last seven years(p.65)." (8:85-86)

In addition to the narrative section, the report contained two composite rating sheets, one for basic teacher education programs and one for the advanced programs. Such parts of the programs as faculty, physical resources, administration, advising, admissions procedures, et cetera, were listed and places provided for a numerical rating of each, apparently with a range of 1 - 4. On the form for the basic programs the library was rated as 3 and on the form for the advanced programs as 4. On the forms themselves, no place was provided for any commentary or explanations.

It is difficult to respond to either the comments or the ratings contained in the report because specifics are not given. If, following the comment above, which was that "members of the team found library

holdings to be significantly below the levels required by an institution of this size and complexity" it had specified what subjects or, better yet, what titles were lacking, then a factual determination could be made. But this was not done and so the comment is valueless and probably not based on any actual investigation whatever. As far as is known only two members of the team visited the library and then for only a total of about six hours. In the institutional report the entire "L" class of the Library of Congress classification had been broken down into sub-classes and shelf list holdings reported for each. Why didn't the library evaluator or other members of the team point out where the deficiencies were by using this table? Shown twice in another table were the percentages of titles contained in certain basic checklists that were held. Why didn't the report state where the deficiencies were? But no such facts are given. Due to lack of specificity the comments are of little or no value.

The Evaluation Board--The report of the visiting team was forwarded to an Evaluation Board which is appointed by NCATE. This board reviews the institutional report as well as the visiting team's report and meets with representatives of the institution and the chairman of the visiting team.

In preparation for this meeting the Dean of Education prepared a rather lengthy summary of important data about the library, most of which had appeared in the institutional report but apparently had not been read or had been misinterpreted. Several important parts of this statement follow:

> Between 1902 and 1966 the book collection had grown to only 150,399 volumes or, for a period of 64 years, the average

annual rate of addition (not counting withdrawals) was only 2,349. Our currently monthly rate of processing volumes through the Catalog Department alone (including microforms) is 2,328 (July 1973 - January 1974). Thus, currently almost as many volumes are being added in one month as were added during an average year prior to 1966 (again excluding withdrawals). If volumes which do not go through the Catalog Department are added to the catalogued figure (and using last year's figures) the monthly rate would be 3,273, which is about 1 1/2 times the average annual rate of increase between 1902 - 1966.

In terms of certain basic bibliographies of checklists, the book collection contains the following percentages of the titles listed (June 30, 1973):

Books for College Libraries ----------	86 percent
Outstanding Academic Books, 1973 -----	98.7 percent
New Scholarly Books in America (Winter, 1973) ----------	87.8 percent
Outstanding Educational Books of 1971-	100 percent
The American Behavioral Scientist, 1972 ----------	86.6 percent

When the 13 Illinois State University libraries are ranked in terms of book holdings and current subscriptions to periodicals, Western Illinois University stands as follows:

Book holdings - 7
Periodicals - 4

Thus, we are ahead of all other Board of Governor institutions, plus Sangamon State in book holdings, and only the University of Illinois at Urbana, Southern Illinois University and Northern Illinois University are ahead of us in periodical subscriptions.

The number of periodicals on education currently received are:

860 (includes all phases of education) out of a total of 5,547).

This figure includes all titles indexed in Education Index, about 75 percent of those in Current Index to Journals in Education, and over 90 percent of the titles in Educational Administration Abstracts.

A use study of the Periodicals Department, conducted in 1972, showed that aside from the popular and general titles, educational periodicals ranked high in terms of use.

The North Central Association report of 1971 included the following evaluation of the library at Western Illinois University:

> "The improvement of the library at Western Illinois University in the period since the 1967 visit is highly satisfactory. The only major weakness at the present time is grossly inadequate space available for the library holdings."

The Dean's plea was that the consensus ratings of 3 and 4 for the library were too harsh and asked that, if, after reconsidering the data, the board still had reservations about the quality of the library that NCATE consider sending an expert library consultant to make another evaluation.

It is appropriate at this time to emphasize the statement quoted from the report of the 1971 evaluation prepared by a North Central Association visiting team. Here again it was based on a two or three day visit during which only one or two persons visited the library for a few hours. But this report, except for the comment about inadequate space, is favorable. Quite in contrast to the NCATE team evaluation, which took place only two years later, and which gave the library low ratings.

It is pertinent to add that had the library evaluator examined the Clapp-Jordan Formula she would have found that 18,000 volumes provided "liminal adequacy" for a field of graduate concentration, even doctoral level.(6:374) Thus, the 15,840 volumes on Education shown in the institutional report were surely sufficient for the Master's and Sixth Year programs.(3:67)

The meeting with the Evaluation Board took place in March, 1974. Apparently the Board was favorably impressed with the arguments presented by the institution because in May, 1974 a letter was received from the Director of NCATE announcing reaccreditation of all programs

for which it was requested and stating that a more detailed letter would follow.

Conclusions--

1. The library evaluator assigned was largely unqualified. Although she had the basic credential of the professional librarian, the Master of Arts Degree in Library Science, she had received it many years ago and had not kept up with recent developments. Her ignorance of basic bibliography, book selection aids, and standards for college and university libraries was shocking. She had had no experience at all in college and university libraries, having been a school librarian for more than twenty years.

2. The Provost and the Dean of Education erred seriously in not checking on the qualifications of NCATE's nominees for the visiting team or referring the matter to the appropriate subordinates for so doing. This was a very vital point because the qualification's of the evaluators are of prime importance. In the case of the library, not only did it negate the value of the visit but it caused mischief and embarrassment. In one of the meetings of the subcommittee on resources and facilities, during the planning period, the author had proposed that a library specialist be requested. Rather grudgingly, the subcommittee supported the request, but the general planning committee vetoed it without explanation. This, too, was a serious error.

3. In retrospect, it is clear that it was a mistake to provide so much detail about the library in the institutional report. For the most part it was either not understood or misinterpreted by the evaluator. Instead a narrative, non-statistical report describing the

progress made in collection building during the past eight years would have been preferable. Although the library did have its weaknesses, they never would have been found by the visiting team since they knew so little about evaluating a library.

4. In final analysis, this was no evaluation of a library at all. But it was exactly what might be expected to result when unqualified persons, using vague and rather meaningless standards, and knowing little or nothing about procedures for evaluating a university library, become involved in it.

Recommendations--

1. NCATE should reconsider its practice of selecting visiting team members from rosters of nominees provided by its constituent and associate organizations.(11) Apparently it makes no assessment of their qualifications. In particular, it should not use school librarians as evaluators of college or university libraries. Despite the fact that the basic education of school librarians and college or university librarians is quite similar, they operate under different standards, and use quite different materials. In fact, they live in different worlds. The use of school personnel for such assignments was also questioned by Edelfeit who says " . . . to date, there have been numerous occasions on which school personnel have not been sufficiently informed on the intricacies of teacher education to render significant judgments or advice on teacher-training programs. If school personnel are to be participants in the accrediting process, it is essential that at least a cadre of practitioners be selected and trained to serve this function."(12) In light of this comment, then, this was not the only evaluation in which the qualifications of the visiting team were questioned.

2. NCATE should arrange with one of the library associations, preferable the Association of College and Research Libraries, to nominate persons qualified to evaluate college and university libraries. Undoubtedly, persons nominated would be willing to serve for expenses only, which is the present practice. This recommendation is made despite the fact that NCATE does not, as a general rule, appoint subject matter specialists to visiting teams.*(13:81) But library service should not be thought of as a subject, rather as a basic support service to all subjects.

3. NCATE should revise its standard on libraries so that it is more specific and meaningful. This is not to suggest that a detailed set of quantitative standards on collections, personnel, finance, etc., be developed but rather that the vagueness, even pointlessness, of the present statements be removed. Again, it is believed that the Association of College and Research Libraries could assist with this task.

---

*This is not done in order to avoid the heavy expense to the institution that assigning a large group of subject specialists would entail; also, because NCATE relies upon the regional accrediting association to certify the quality of programs in academic subjects.

REFERENCES

1. Deighton, Lee C., ed. The Encyclopedia of Education. New York: The Macmillan Company and The Free Press, ©1971. Vol. VI.

2. National Council For Accreditation of Teacher Education. NCATE, 24th Annual List. 77-78. n.d.

3. Western Illinois University. Accreditation Report to The National Council For Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1973-74. August 1, 1973. 3 vols.

4. National Council For Accreditation of Teacher Education. Standards For Accreditation of Teacher Education; The Accreditation of Basic and Advanced Preparation Programs For Professional School Personnel. Washington, D.C.: NCATE, 1970. 25pp.

5. National Council For Accreditation of Teacher Education. Guide For Preparing the Institutional Report. Washington, D.C., NCATE, 1971. 30pp.

6. Clapp, Verner W., and Jordan, Robert T. "Quantitative Criteria For Adequacy of Academic Library Collections," College and Research Libraries 26:371-80, September, 1965.

7. Background Paper on Curriculum Laboratories. Archives and Special Collections Department. Western Illinois University Library. 1973. (In Curriculum Laboratory file).

8. Report of the NCATE Visiting Teams to Western Illinois University. 1973. Various pagings. (Available in the Office of the Dean, School of Education, Western Illinois University).

9. Letter to NCATE Evaluation Board from Dean of the College of Education, Western Illinois University, March 14, 1974.

10. Letter to President John T. Bernhard, Western Illinois University from Rolf W. Larson, Director of NCATE, May 16, 1974.

11. Letter to author from Doran Christenson, Associate Director, NCATE, November 17, 1978.

12. Edelfeit, R. A. "Whither NCATE," Journal of Teacher Education 21:3-4+, Spring, 1970.

13. Mayor, John R. and Schwartz, Willis G. Accreditation in Teacher Education; Its Influence on Higher Education. Washington, D.C., National Commission on Accrediting, ©1965. xvi, 311pp.